Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

do; many a mistake is scotched here before it can get into the pupils' work.

The article gives specimens of examinations in prose required at the final examination and other information which should be of interest to teachers.

G. L.

## HOW FAR DOES THE WORD-ORDER IN LATIN INDICATE THE PROPER EMPHASIS?

(Continued from page 2)

Again we may test by this same principle the assertion that the verb is never emphatic when final, but is emphatic in proportion as it recedes from the end.

Now, first of all, the Romans felt that the finite verb normally belonged at the end of a Latin sentence, whatever their reasons for such a feeling may have been. Quintilian says expressly (9. 4. 26) verbo sensum cludere multo, si compositio patiatur, optimum est. . . . sine dubio erit omne quod non cludit hyperbaton: "To close a sentence with a verb is far the best, if harmony of structure permits. . . . Doubtless every verb that is not at the end is a case of hyperbaton".

Why is this order best? Because, says the great teacher, "the strength of language lies in verbs" (Ibid.; 1. 4. 18). In view of these explicit statements it is once more surprising to read in one grammar (A. and S., p. 377) " it was a Roman habit of thought to put the least emphatic part of a statement into verb form[1]". The Latin verb, on the contrary, had a power of condensed and weighty expression which is entirely unknown to most modern languages. In English the imperative is the only verb form that can constitute a complete sentence. The Latin, in which the personal endings retained their pronominal force, naturally delighted in heaping coordinate verbs together and thus telling a tale or voicing an emotion with unsurpassable brevity, vigor and animation. Was Caesar aiming at the least possible emphasis when he wrote to the Senate, *Veni, vidi, vici?* No doubt many who know this famous despatch and very little Latin besides regard it as a stroke of genius, one more proof of his daring originality. Nothing of the kind. Any slave or parasite on the stage might easily outdo it. In Phormio 103, 104, we have *imus, venimus, videmus.* And again (135, 136)*persuasumst homini, factumst; ventumst, vincimur: duxit.* Further (186) *Loquarne? incendam; taceam? instigem; purgem me? laterem lavem.* Scarcely less familiar than Caesar's message is Cicero's *abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit.* Incidentally we may consider whether the effect would have been better if the words had been arranged in the reverse order and delivered thus: "He has BROKEN OUT, he has *escaped,* he has withdrawn, he has gone away". Again we have in the third Catiline (16) a sentence consisting of five verbs: *appellare, temptare, sollicitare poterat, audebat.* The verb, then, having such potentialities, was regarded as embodying in itself the pith and point of the sentence. First the subject of remark, not for emphasis, but for clearness; last the thing said, for which alone, or chiefly, the subject, the object and all their modifiers had been introduced. But like every linguistic usage this order, adopted for the sake of emphasis, became the usual thing even in unimpassioned utterance, and, therefore, often the order of least emphasis. In the verb, speaking generally, lies the force of language, but not every verb is forceful. Hence, by a mere habit of speech, the verb is often found at the end of its clause, like Cicero's favorite *esse videatur,* when no special stress can fairly be thrown upon it. This fact, however, should not blind us to other phenomena, whose significance is unmistakable.

The fact seems to be that verbs of energetic meaning, and those that are sharply contrasted with others preceding or following, commonly stand last. Those which recede from the end are the copula *sum,* the imperative[1], and words of weak or indifferent meaning, where another word might easily be substituted without affecting the course of thought.

The most conclusive examples, perhaps, are those in which the same verb is repeated. In the Laelius (82) we have *nam maximum ornamentum amicitiae tollit, qui ex ea tollit verecundiam.* If "the more important word never stands last for emphasis", why is the first *tollit* at the end of its clause, and the second displaced by its object *verecundiam?* Is it not clear that the first *tollit* is more emphatic than the second, and the second less emphatic than the object? To hold the opposite view is as absurd as it would be for a player to deliver Hamlet's line thus: "If thou wilt needs *marry,* MARRY a fool". In the Cato Maior (76) we read Ergo, ut *superiorum aetatum* studia *occidunt,* sic occidunt etiam SENECTUTIS, and in Milo 34 At eo repugnante *fiebat,* immo vero eo fiebat MAGIS[2]. And in the De Natura Deorum (1. 17) Cicero writes Sed ut hic qui intervenit (me intuens) ne ignoret quae res agatur, *de natura* agebamus DEORUM.

But are not these transpositions merely instances of chiasmus, long ago adequately discussed by Nägelsbach? Chiasmus may serve us as a designation, but it tells us absolutely nothing about principles. The 9th edition of the Stilistik expressly states that no law has yet been laid down to determine whether anaphora or chiasmus is better in a given case, or which words, in the chiastic arrangement, shall constitute the means and which the extremes (Stilistik 697). Is it not more than possible that appropriate emphasis if often a decisive factor?

---

[1] A logical inference from the editor's theory and the facts of Latin usage, theory and inference, in the present writer's view, alike erroneous.

[1] Just why the imperative so often comes early in the sentence the writer is not prepared to say.

[2] Allen and Greenough 597, b is refuted by a multitude of such sentences. The construction here is complete: *magis* is not an "afterthought", nor can it be conceived as "beginning a new sentence".

But it is time to speak more broadly of sentence-structure as a whole. Emphasis, then, in the Latin period is, in general, progressive, forward-moving The more significant or telling words, phrases, and clauses follow those which are less so. This may have resulted simply from the orator's habitual use of climax, and the demands of emphasis may not have been consciously regarded; but the fact is easily established. In our *thinking,* we are likely to fasten on the most important things first; the fact first, then, if we have leisure, the reason for the fact, the historical event first, then, if it is striking or important, the date of the event. But when we make our speech or write our history, our causal clauses will precede, the facts will follow. We shall put the date first; *postero die, inita aestate,* or a clause after *cum, ubi, ut primum,* or the like, and the thing that happened will come later. And such is the order commonly found in Latin. But Professor Greenough taught that in the order of prominence, cause precedes result, purpose, manner, and the like the act (601, b). More errors could hardly be crowded into so few words. The only sort of pure purpose clause that regularly precedes the main verb is the parenthetical clause of the *ne plura dicam* order. Such clauses are necessarily unemphatic; there is no verb expressed on which they depend; and invariably they precede the thing that is considered important enough to be stated.

But what of this claim that causes were more prominent in the Roman mind than results? When or where in the history of mankind was this ever true, except of the ultra-philosophical or scientific? If men had been naturally more interested in causes than results, magic arts would not have endured so long, nor would science have been born so late.

But the implication in most of our grammars is that result clauses often precede the main clause. Those who hold the Greenough theory say, "for emphasis". It is astonishing that this error should be so widespread. Pure result clauses in good prose, so far as the writer has observed, invariably follow the word or words expressing the cause. The result-clause is a fact-clause; the main clause frequently conveys no definite idea (*non enim tu is es,* for example), but is simply the vestibule to a veritable colonnade of result clauses; the demonstratives that so commonly precede result clauses, such as *tantus, talis, tam, ita,* etc., are vague, arousing expectancy, but really almost meaningless by themselves; how then can any one resist the conclusion that, in the case of the result-clause at least, we certainly find the more prominent clause coming last.

As regards co-ordinate expressions also, climax is the controlling principle, wherever the nature of the discourse permits. In quiet narrative or description there is small occasion for climactic effects and the order is logical, chronological, or simply customary. But whenever strong effects are sought, climax determines the arrangement. Indeed Quintilian observes (9. 4. 25), "It is a proof of too great scrupulosity, also, to put that always first which is first in the order of time; not that this order is not frequently to be preferred, but because that which was earlier in the doing is often of greater importance, and ought consequently to be put after less important matters".

Now is not this climactic order precisely what we should expect? How can we imagine a literary artist in any language framing sentences like this: "Catiline's purpose is murderous, hostile, really unkind?" We shall certainly look in vain for such writing in Cicero.

The co-ordinating mechanism of the Latin supplies abundant evidence in favor of forward-moving emphasis. Combinations like *cum—tum,* also *tum vero* (*maxime, multo magis,* etc.), and *non modo* or *solum* followed by *sed* or *verum etiam* are unmistakably climactic[1].

In reference to some of these Kühner speaks of diminishing emphasis ("Herabsteigung"). No part of this study has seemed to the writer more interesting and significant than the examination of this statement and the accompanying examples. A correct hypothesis is pretty sure to explain more than the facts which gave rise to it: it is likely to result even in the discovery of principles previously unthought of.

Upon considering Kühner's material attentively (2. 673), it soon became evident that ascending emphasis was required in every instance. The examples are characterized by the correlatives *non modo* (*solum*) . . . *sed* (not *sed etiam*). Here the learned German finds sometimes "Aufsteigung", ascending emphasis, and sometimes "Herabsteigung", according as the less forceful or comprehensive word precedes or follows. Thus Cicero says (Planc. 31. 76) non modo lacrimulam, sed multas lacrimas et fletum cum singultu videre potuisti: "You might have observed not merely the trace of a tear, but many tears, and weeping with convulsive sobs." Obviously the larger terms succeed the smaller and require the stronger emphasis. When the second member is negative, Kühner teaches that we have descending emphasis. Let us take a single example. In the Tusculan Disputations (2. 34), speaking of Spartan youths scourged at the altars, Cicero says quorum non modo nemo exclamavit umquam, sed ne ingemuit quidem: "But of these not only did no one ever cry out, but not even did a single one groan".

---

[1] For a more adequate summary of the evidence on this point see School Review 15. 643-654.

*Exclamavit* is of course a stronger word than *ingemuit.* But when a youth is undergoing torture, it is more astonishing that he should refrain from groaning than from screaming.

And just here emerges a principle which, so far as the writer has been able to learn, has never been noted in any of our works on rhetoric and style. It is this: while in a climax of affirmatives the successive words or phrases must increase in breadth or intensity of meaning, in a climax of negatives they must decrease. For example, if we wish to deny what Cicero affirmed in the last citation but one, we should say, "You could have observed no weeping and convulsive sobbing, nor *many tears,* nor even the TRACE of a tear".

Now all of Kühner's examples under this head, covering nearly a page, are of this same type. The great German, and many another student of this subject no doubt, noting simply the diminishing intensity of the words as such, assumed that emphasis must also diminish.

Now without doubt any competent Latinist gets the meaning of a Latin sentence, whatever his theory of arrangement may be; but sometimes this doctrine of forward-moving emphasis is essential to accurate interpretation. In the De Finibus Cicero says of the Epicurean type of wise man, Erit enim instructus ad mortem contemnendam, ad exsilium, ad ipsum etiam dolorem. This series, *mortem, exilium, dolorem,* would seem, at first glance, anticlimactic. The law of negative climax does not apply, and without doubt *mortem* is to us a more fearsome word than *exsilium,* and the latter stronger than *dolorem.* But the *ipsum etiam* should not be overlooked, and besides climax is always to be assumed when there is room for it. What is Cicero discussing? the behavior of an Epicurean confronting the ills of life. Now the Epicurean's *extremum malum* is not death, nor exile, but pain. Cicero had tried exile for himself and had found it worse than death. The order therefore is strictly climactic. "The wise Epicurean", he says, "will be prepared to think lightly of death, of *exile,* and even of PAIN *itself*".

The principle is also important to the accurate discrimination of synonyms. When Cicero says that the Romans are *appetentes gloriae atque avidi laudis,* the order at once suggests that *avidus* is a stronger word than *appetens.* When he asks (Cat. 2. 19) whether Catiline's adherents hope to be *consules ac dictatores, aut etiam reges,* the order would suggest the relative grade of the offices, if we had no previous knowledge of them.

And finally these views, if correct, are essential to put us in the right attitude toward Latin prose composition. What, then, shall we teach our pupils in the matter of order?

(1) The normal order for the detached sentence is the traditional one, subject with its modifiers, objects with their modifiers, and last the verb. When, as often happens, the subject is in the personal ending, the object leads off. Take for example the last chapter of the Gallic War (7. 90). Here we have fifteen finite verbs, and all but two in main clauses. The sentences are largely detached, and in consequence the verb is final in every case but one.

(2) The verbs which recede from the end are such as the copula, the imperative, and verbs that are neither energetic or sonorous. Any verb, however, may yield its place to subject, object, or adverb, when these deserve such prominence. In the Pro Murena (61) Cicero concludes a summary of Stoicism, in which nearly every verb but *esse* is final, by saying *sententiam mutare nunquam,* "he changes his opinion *never*". So Quintilian (9. 4. 30) highly approves him for placing *postridie* last in a sentence found in the second Philippic (26), "Transfer the last word to some other place", he says, "and it will have less force, for it gives the conclusion the effect of a sword thrust" (nam totius ductus hic est quasi mucro).

(3) The beginning of a sentence is not *per se* an emphatic position. The fourth Catiline begins with *Video,* the Roscius with *Credo.* How unreasonable to claim that these are the most emphatic words in their respective sentences. Exordia always begin quietly, and his seeing or supposing is as nothing in comparison with the fact which he sees, the things which he supposes. The verb, moreover, since it may constitute an entire sentence, is brought in at any point without violence, and may even be sandwiched in between two more emphatic words. In the Murena (13) we read *Saltatorem appellat L. Murenam Cato.* How shall we paraphrase? Here we have the object first and clearly emphatic; the verb is next and just as clearly unemphatic; *Murenam* needs more force than the verb; but what of the subject standing last? Can Cicero mean this? "The charge is brought against Murena of being a dancing man; but it originates with that nobody Cato". Certainly not. Cato's personality was all that made it necessary to answer the charge. And Cicero had the very highest respect for his character and ability. Cato is put last to give it the greatest possible prominence. "Murena is called a dancing man; and the serious part of the matter is that this charge is urged by *Cato*".

(4) An unusual position calls attention to the word so placed. This is true in all languages, probably, and needs no argument. The sentence last quoted is a striking example.

(5) Climax is always to be aimed at when the material allows. The more vigorous substantive, epithet, verb, adverb, phrase, or clause should follow, and the effect is to be accentuated by climactic connectives far more freely than would be elegant in

English. Cf. Cat. 4. 6 manavit non solum per Italiam, verum etiam transcendit Alpis, et obscure serpens multas iam provincias occupavit[1]. If the series is negative, the order should of course be reversed.

(6) Emphatic words are often to be thrown into relief by interposing less important words between. Such are the enclitics *quidem* and *quis,* the forms of *esse* (cf. the enclitic forms in Greek) and the indefinite pronouns generally. Cf. Milo 4 *timorem, si* quem *habetis,* DEPONITE*;* Cat. 4. 6, *Huic* si PAUCOS putatis *adfines* esse, *vehementer* ERRATIS.

(7) But when all is said that can be said about the laws of arrangement in Latin, we shall not be prepared to hem our pupils in by hard and fast lines. Position alone does not determine emphasis, simply because emphasis alone did not determine position. So many elements were involved, individual taste and preference counted for so much, that if the same Greek paragraph had been assigned to Cicero, Sallust, Caesar, Varro and Atticus to be translated into Latin, we may be sure that no two would have adopted the same order, any more than an equal number of literary men would today in rendering German into English. Really the natural succession of ideas is much the same in Latin as in our own tongue. Cicero said to the people, using the plain style, "First we showed Cethegus a seal: he recognized (it). *We* the thread cut: we read. It was written in his own hand to the Allobroges's senate and people, that he, what to their representatives he had promised, would do; he prayed that likewise they would do what upon themselves their representatives had taken". Again, "Then I showed tablets to Lentulus, and asked whether he recognized the seal. He nodded. 'It is verily,' I said, 'a known indeed seal, the likeness of grandfather your, a most illustrious man, who loved in a singular degree country and citizens his; which indeed ought to have withheld you from so great wickedness even mute". In the last clause the predicate *revocare debuit* is final, otherwise the English is made to follow the Latin order. Probably few teachers of elementary composition the country over would accept a Latin exercise arranged so nearly like English. Finally we should in any case make it clear to our pupils that a Latin sentence of any considerable length has its low levels separating the heights of emphasis. It is not a toboggan slide nor a causeway, but a range of hills, a succession of eminences, severed not by impassable gorges, but by gentle and agreeable depressions, and rising higher and ever higher, till at the end we stand on a summit from which we can survey the whole route by which we ascended, and look far out upon what lies beyond. Or, if we look at such a composition from a distance, as with the eye of an artist, the sky-line is agreeably broken and we feel that we should like to transfer to our own canvas that which seems to be beautified with the inimitable grace and negligence of Nature herself.

JOHN GREENE

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

## REVIEW

Caesar's Gallic War. By Walter B. Gunnison and Walter S. Harley. New York: Silver, Burdett and Co. (1907). Pp. xxxvi + 460 (plates and maps). $1.25.

Caesar's Gallic War, by Messrs. Gunnison and Harley, appears with its neat red cover and decoration of eagle and fasces, to be but another member of the large family we already know. But a glance at the preface tends to dispel such an idea, for it explains how the authors, after experience of their own, have ventured on an experiment that is likely to prove interesting. With compassion for the children seen staggering daily to and from school under Latin grammar, prose book and Caesar, they have conceived the idea of compressing into one book all the material necessary for the second year of Latin. This effort surely ought to win the gratitude not only of the wise school boards that request children to carry books under the right arm on odd days of the month, and under the left arm on even days, to prevent warping and twisting their spinal columns, but also of the children themselves who must be weary of their burdens. The economy, too, would be appreciated by many families; and the convenience of having all the material easily placed for reference would mean a great saving of time to pupils who have at best in second year Latin about all they can do.

The text of the book comprises the Gallic War, Books I-IV, and the equivalent of a fifth book made up of selections taken from the most interesting parts of Books V, VI, and VII, to be used either by bright classes that have finished the required work (alas! how few they are!), or for sight reading. This extra book would afford an opportunity for teachers who would like to substitute some of the interesting material of the later books for the less vital parts of the first four.

The notes are clear and concise with references to the Grammatical Appendix following. The typography here is especially good. Chapters are separated and numbered by Arabic numerals and the numbers of the lines referred to, arranged in a column on the left, easily catch the eye; the long passages of indirect discourse are reproduced in direct form with verbs in heavier type, and there are references to and quotations from Holmes, Dodge, Fowler, Froude and Plutarch, which tend to sustain interest.

---

[1] The attentive reader will note the lack of energetic meaning in *manavit;* also that its position next to *malum* (see context) insures perspicuity; *transcendit* is vigorous but yields to the still more vigorous *Alpis;* while the most ominous assertion stands last and concludes with a dichoreus.